

## **REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 2, 4 and 12 and leaves claims 5, 6, 9, 13 and 14. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14.

The disclosure stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Amendments were made to the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4-6 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 2, 4-6 and 9 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 2, 4-6 and 9 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 2, 4-6 and 9 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0105837) in view of Sundsted (articled entitled "JNDI overview, Part 1- Part 4, JavaWorld.com"); claims 4-6, 13 and 14 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen in view of Sundsted and further in view of Zhao (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0099970); and claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen in view of Sundsted, and Lindholm (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,754) and

further in view of Bortvedt (articled entitled “Functional Specification for Object Caching Service for Java, 2.0). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14 are not taught or suggested by Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao, Lindholm and Bortvedt whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to recite that the present invention is directed to a distributed object controlling method for a first computer and the first computer itself.

According to the present invention the first computer executes an object and has first and second reference information storage areas, wherein the first computer is connected to a second computer which has a naming service unit.

Further, according to the present invention the distributed object controlling method includes storing, when executing an object in the first computer, object reference-information for the object in both the second reference-information storage area of the first computer and the naming service unit of the second computer, and judging, when executing a retrieval request of another object, whether or not object reference information on the another object has been stored in the second reference-information storage area, executing, when the object reference information on the another object

has been stored in the second reference-information storage area, communication with the another object based on the object reference information of the another object, judging, when the object reference information on the another object has not been stored in the second reference-information storage area, whether or not object reference information on the another object has been stored in the first reference-information storage area, and executing, when the object reference information on the another object has been stored in the first reference-information storage area, communication with the another object based on the object reference information on the another object stored in the first reference-information storage area,

Still further, according to the present invention the distributed object controlling method further includes sending, when the object reference information on the another object has not been stored in the first reference-information storage area, a retrieval request to the second computer for providing a naming service, the retrieval request including the object name of the object, storing object reference information and an object name of the object into the first reference-information storage area, the object reference information being acquired as the response to the retrieval request, executing communication with the another objection based on the acquired object reference information, and deleting the object reference information of the object from both the second reference-information storage area of the first computer and the naming service unit of the second computer.

According to Applicants the object of the present invention is to shorten the processing time for an object call-up by reducing the number of

communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, to reduce a load onto the naming service by reducing the number of communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, or to reduce communications that occur when making a processing request to an object that exists within an identical process.

Attention is directed to page 2, lines 4-15 of the present application.

Particularly, the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims provides for the registration of an object as described on page 12, line 4 through page 13, line 9 and as illustrated in Fig. 2 of the present application and the deletion of the registration of an object as described on page 15, line 16 through page 16, line 22 and as illustrated in Fig. 4 of the present application.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao, Lindholm or Bortvedt whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Numerous arguments were presented in the Remarks of the December 3, 2007 and the May 20, 2008 Amendments distinguishing the features of the present invention for the references of record. Applicants hereby incorporate by reference the arguments presented in the Remarks of the December 3, 2007 and the May 20, 2008 Amendments.

To further explain the differences between the features of the present invention from the teachings of the prior art of record the following is provided.

Kamen teaches a Client Cache (Fig. 2, 24) for Proxy Instance and describes: The client runtime 24 also stores a reference to the newly-created proxy instance in the client cache 22.

The Examiner alleges that Sundsted teaches the retrieval request including the object name of the object,

The Examiner alleges that Lindholm teaches storing an object reference in two levels, local/thread level and application/global level.

Zhao teaches Cluster in the Naming Service (Fig. 2; [0028]) and to automatically remove the stale object reference from the cluster ([0036]). Each cluster contains its own unique object binding table which contains object references which each typically represent a single server ([0031]).

Bortvedt teaches to return a reference to the object associated with name (page 15 last para.).

However, none of the references as described above teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now recited in the claims. Particularly, none of the references teach or suggest shortening the processing time for an object call-up by reducing the number of communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, reducing a load onto the naming service by reducing the number of communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, or reducing communications that occur when making a processing request to an object that exists within an identical process as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

More particularly, none of the references teach or suggest that a second computer provides a naming service unit, that the registering of an object is performed by storing the object reference information for the object in

both of the second reference information storage area of the first computer and the naming service unit of the second computer, and that the deleting of the registration of an object is performed by deleting the object reference information of the object from both the second reference information storage area of the first computer and the naming service unit of the second computer as now recited in the claims.

Thus, each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao, Lindholm or Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest a first computer for executing an object and having first and second reference-information storage areas, said first computer being connected to a second computer which has a naming service unit as recited in the claims.

Further, each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao, Lindholm or Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest storing, when executing an object in said first computer, object reference-information for said object in both said second reference-information storage area of said first computer and said naming service unit of said second computer as recited in the claims.

Still further, each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao, Lindholm or Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest deleting said object reference information of said object from both said second reference-information storage area of said first computer and said naming service unit of said second computer as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao, Lindholm and Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims, combining these references in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action does not render obvious the

claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14 as being unpatentable over the combinations of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao, Lindholm and Bortvedt is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of the present application based on claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.42890X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/Carl I. Brundidge/

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 684-1120